

REMARKS

Claims 1-17 are pending in the application. These claims were rejected as follows:

Claims / Section	35 U.S.C. Sec.	References / Notes
1-17	§103(a) Obviousness	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Anderson (U.S. Patent No. 5,721,783);• Nishdai Japanese Patent Application Publication 2000-183782; and• Katayanagi, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,732,390).

5 Applicant has provided below discussion for distinguishing the present invention from the art cited against it.

Applicant's use of reference characters below is for illustrative purposes only and is not intended to be limiting in nature unless explicitly indicated.

10 **35 U.S.C. §103(a), CLAIMS 1-17 OBVIOUSNESS OVER ANDERSON IN VIEW OF NISHDAI AND KATAYANAGI**

In the OA, on p. 2, the Examiner stated that Anderson teaches all of the elements of claim 1, with the exception of an antenna device that comprises a self-exciting oscillation circuit. The Examiner then stated:

15 Nishdai teaches an antenna circuit for a transmitter/receiver comprising a self-oscillation circuit (See abstract solution and fig. 9). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to utilize an antenna comprising a self
20 oscillation circuit for size reduction and reduced power consumption.

However, Applicant respectfully disagrees with this characterization. First, the present invention is directed to the art of hearing aids, whereas Nishidai

comprises teaching directed to the art of telecommunications—one of ordinary skill in the art would not look to the Nishidai reference related to telecommunications in trying to solve a problem related to hearing aids.

Furthermore, Nishidai does not disclose an oscillation circuit that is a part
5 of the antenna. Figures 3, 4, 5, 6 and 9 all show the LC oscillation circuit comprising L20 and C20 as being a part of an RF oscillator circuit 2 (see Nishidai [0011], which is described entirely separate and distinct from the antenna 8 (paragraph [0014], and, namely, contains a generator. According to the present invention as claimed in claims 1 and 7, it is the antenna itself that comprises the
10 self-exciting oscillation circuit. This is particularly relevant with regard to claims 2 and 8 wherein the antenna device consists exclusively of the LC oscillation circuit.

Therefore, even if, *arguendo*, one of ordinary skill in the art would consider relevant art from the telecommunications field, even the combination of Nishdai
15 and Anderson does not teach or suggest all of the elements, as claimed in claim 1.

Similarly, regarding claims 6 and 16, the Katayanagi reference relates to the field of telecommunications, and specifically relates to portable telephones (see Abstract and 1/33-38, e.g.); therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art would
20 not consider applying a solution directed to the portable telephone field to the present implementation directed to a hearing aid.

With regard to claim 12, the Examiner indicates that Nishidai teaches an LC oscillation circuit that is configured both to generate a carrier frequency for

transmission and to clock the receiving device (referring to Figs. 1 and 4, and translated paragraphs 0011-0013. Applicant does not disagree that Nishidai teaches an LC oscillation circuit the generates a carrier frequency, but are unable to see Nishidai's teaching related to the clocking of a receiving device in

5 the sections cited by the Examiner. In the event this rejection is maintained, Applicant respectfully requests that the specific elements of Figs. 1 and 4 as well as the specific language used in paragraphs 0011-0013 be identified more specifically. This assertion applies to claims 14 and 17 as well.

With regard to dependent claims 13 and 15, the Examiner reiterates the

10 arguments made with respect to claim 12, but identifies Nishidai's filter (7) as reading on the filter of claim 13. Applicant does not see a teaching of clocking a filter in Nishidai, and notes that the descriptive sections of Nishidai cited by the Examiner do not discuss the filter element in any manner.

For these reasons, Applicant asserts that the claim language clearly

15 distinguishes over the prior art, and respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the §103(a) rejection from the present application.

CONCLUSION

Inasmuch as each of the objections have been overcome by the amendments, and all of the Examiner's suggestions and requirements have been satisfied, it is respectfully requested that the present application be reconsidered, the rejections be withdrawn and that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Respectfully submitted,

 (Reg. No. 45,877)

Mark Bergner
SCHIFF HARDIN, LLP
PATENT DEPARTMENT
6600 Sears Tower
Chicago, Illinois 60606-6473
(312) 258-5779
Attorney for Applicants
Customer Number 26574

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as First Class Mail in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, PO Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on November 14, 2005.

